

## REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request that the above-identified application be reexamined.

Claims 1, 2, 6-9, and 11-23 are pending in this application. The Office Action mailed August 5, 2008 (hereinafter "Office Action"), rejected Claims 1, 2, 6-9, and 11-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable in view of the teachings of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0125736, to Ferri et al. (hereinafter "Ferri et al.").

Applicants wish to thank Examiner Bashore and Examiner Alvesteffer for their time and cooperation during the telephone interview conducted on October 14, 2008. Differences between the claimed invention and prior art have been discussed.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 and for the reasons set forth below, applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims. Prior to discussing in detail why applicants believe that all the claims in this application are allowable, a brief description of the disclosed subject matter and brief descriptions of the teachings of the cited and applied references are provided. The following descriptions of the disclosed subject matter and the cited and applied references are not provided to define the scope or interpretation of any of the claims of this application. Instead, these descriptions are provided solely to assist the United States Patent and Trademark Office in recognizing the differences between the pending claims and the cited references, and should not be construed as limiting on the disclosed subject matter.

### Disclosed Subject Matter

A method and system that renders a graphical user interface including at least one viewable graphical element, the graphical element having a filename associated therewith, the filename being absent from the user interface, are provided. In one exemplary form, the method comprises: reviewing data associated with a filename and a format of the filename, the filename having an associated icon; determining if a filename is not to be displayed based on the review; and congregating icons without displayable filenames in at least one row. The determination

results in a file name not being displayed with the graphical element, when the graphical element is rendered, if data associated with a component of the file name is determined to be image data or multimedia data. The number of icons congregated in the at least one row is greater than a comparable row with icons having filenames being displayed by, for example, aligning graphic elements without displayable filenames more closely with surrounding graphical elements by reducing the space therebetween.

Summary of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0125736 – Ferri et al.

Ferri et al. purportedly describes a method of organizing icons on a desktop into groups and displaying the icon groups in segments on the desktop. More specifically, Ferri et al. describes a Configuration Program (CP), an Icon Grouping Program (IGP), and an Icon Organization Program (IOP). The CP allows a user to define at least one segment on the desktop. The user defines the segment location, the segment size, the types of icons associated with the segment, the icon organization within the segment, and whether the segment covers the desktop wallpaper. The IGP analyzes the icons and places the icons into the proper segments based on the type of application associated with the icon. The IOP organizes the icons within each segment using the icon organization specified by the user in the CP. The IOP also organizes new icons as they are added to the desktop.

While describing a method of organizing icons on a desktop into groups, Ferri et al. fails to teach, disclose, or suggest determining for each graphical element of the plurality of graphical elements if a filename is or is not to be displayed with the graphical element when the graphical element is rendered, the determination being based on the type of object that the graphical element represents, the determination resulting in a filename not displayed with the graphical element when the graphical element is rendered if the data associated with a component of the filename is determined to be image data or multimedia data.

Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 6-9, and 11-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

As indicated above, Claims 1, 2, 6-9, and 11-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable in view of the teachings of Ferri et al. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claims 1, 2, 6-9, 11, and 12

In regard to independent Claim 1, the Office Action asserts that Ferri et al. teaches determining for each graphical element of the plurality of graphical elements if a filename is or is not to be displayed with the graphical element when the graphical element is rendered, the determination being based on the type of object that the graphical element represents, the determination resulting in a filename not being displayed with the graphical element when the graphical element is rendered, referencing Figure 7 and paragraph [0041]. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Neither in the referenced text nor elsewhere does Ferri et al. describe a determination of whether or not a filename should be displayed with a graphical element based on the type of object that the graphical element represents, as Claim 1 recites. Indeed, the filename is not even mentioned anywhere in Ferri et al. As noted in the Office Action, the icons in segment 602 of Figure 7 of Ferri et al. do not have their file names displayed. However, Ferri et al. fails to describe or suggest determining whether or not these filenames should be displayed along with the icons in segment 602. In the absence of such determination, the fact that the filenames of the icons in segment 602 are not displayed is irrelevant because the absence of filenames in segment 602 can be attributed to any number of reasons.

The Office Action asserts, and applicants agree, that Ferri et al. does not explicitly disclose that data associated with a component of the filename is determined to be image data or multimedia data. The Office Action further asserts that because Ferri et al. discloses that the data associated with a component of the filename is determined to be documents, games, Web pages, development tools, and other, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to define image data and multimedia data as icon groups as a matter of design choice. Even assuming that the above statement is true, which applicants categorically deny, the definition of image data and multimedia data as particular icon groups still will not result in a step of determining whether or not filenames should or should not be displayed with a particular icon group. As indicated above, Ferri et al. does not even mention the determination of whether or not the filename should be displayed with an icon. Instead, Ferri et al. is directed towards analyzing the icons and placing them into the proper display segments based on the type of application associated with the icon. (*see, e.g.*, Abstract.) The question of displaying or not displaying the filename along with the icon is not the subject matter described or suggested by Ferri et al.

In order to further distinguish Claim 1 from Ferri et al., Claim 1 has been amended to include "the graphical user interface comprising a window section," wherein all graphical elements are rendered in the same window section of the graphical user interface. In contrast, Ferri et al.'s icons are displayed in different segments of a desktop. *See, e.g.*, paragraph [0041] and Figure 7.

For at least the reasons above, Ferri et al. fails to teach, disclose, or suggest determining for each graphical element of the plurality of graphical elements if a filename is or is not to be displayed with the graphical element when the graphical element is rendered, the determination being based on the type of object that the graphical element represents, the determination resulting in a filename not being displayed with the graphical element when the graphical element is rendered if data associated with a component of the filename is determined to be image data or multimedia data. As a result, independent Claim 1, as amended, is submitted to be allowable over Ferri et al. Because Claims 2, 6-9, 11, and 12 depend directly or indirectly from Claim 1, Claims 2, 6-9, 11, and 12 are submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 1.

Claims 13-23

Because independent Claims 13 and 23 were rejected under the same rationale as Claim 1, and because Claims 13 and 23 have been amended to recite "the same window section of the graphical user interface" in a manner similar to Claim 1, Claims 13 and 23 are submitted to be allowable for the same reasons as Claim 1. Because Claims 14-21 depend directly or indirectly from Claim 13, Claims 14-21 are submitted to be allowable for at the same reasons as Claim 13. Because Claim 22 recites a computer readable storage device containing instructions for performing the method of Claim 1, Claim 22 is submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 1.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicants respectfully submit that all of the remaining claims in this application are allowable. Consequently, early and favorable action passing this application to issue is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any remaining questions, the Examiner is encouraged to contact applicants' attorney at the number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR  
JOHNSON KINDNESS<sup>PLLC</sup>



Vladimir Raskin, Ph.D.  
Registration No. 62,771  
Direct Dial No. 206.695.1799

VXR:aew

LAW OFFICES OF  
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS<sup>PLLC</sup>  
1420 Fifth Avenue  
Suite 2800  
Seattle, Washington 98101  
206.682.8100